

| | | | |
|---|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 09/994,092 | CHARNE ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | David H Kruse | 1638 | |

All Participants: (1) David H Kruse.
(2) Marianne Michel.

Status of Application: Amended
(3) _____
(4) _____

Date of Interview: 27 September 2004 **Time:** PM

Type of Interview:
☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No
If Yes, provide a brief description: .


Part I.
Rejection(s) discussed:
NONE

Claims discussed:
1,7,13-15,23,29,34 and 56-61

Prior art documents discussed:
NONE

Part II.
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

| | |
|--|--|
|  (Examiner/SPE Signature) | _____ (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate) |
|--|--|

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:
Amendments to the claims for consistence, and to cancel claim 34 in view of the amendment to claim 29. Also discussed the allowability of claims 56-61 and the deposit statement in the Amendment to the specification. The Examiner also indicated that F1 progeny of the exemplified NS3801 B. napus plant having the characteristics of Early Napus and AHAS-herbicide resistance would be allowable subject matter..